

REMARKS

1. Reconsideration and further prosecution of the above-identified application are respectfully requested in view of the amendments and discussion that follows. Claims 1-52 are pending in this application. Claims 1, 2, 23, 44 and 45 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,465,286 to Clare et al. Claims 4, 6-13, 17, 18, 20-22, 24, 26-34, 37, 38, 40-43, 46 and 48-52 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious over Clare et al. Claims 3, 5, 14-16, 19, 25, 35, 36, 39 and 47 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious over Clare et al. in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,465,286 to Matsuda et al. After a careful review of the claims (as amended), it has been concluded that the rejections are in error and the rejections are, therefore, traversed.

2. Claims 1, 2, 23, 44 and 45 have been rejected as being anticipated by Clare et al. Claim 1 has been cancelled. Claims 2, 23, 44 and 45 have been amended to limit the claims to a determination of location based upon log-ons and log-offs of entities of the call center. Support for the amendments may be found in numerous locations within the specification at page 10, line 30 to page 11, line 18.

In contrast, Clare et al. relies upon a plurality of radio transmitting units 60 to determine the location of agents. However, the radio transmitting units 60 of Clare et al. do not provide any information as to the logged-in or logged-out status of its agents. As such, Clare et al. does not provide the same functionality as that of the claimed invention.

3. Claims 4, 6-13, 17, 18, 20-22, 24, 26-34, 37, 38, 40-43, 46 and 48-52 have been rejected as being obvious over Clare et al. However, the independent claims, upon which claims 4, 6-13, 17, 18, 20-22, 24, 26-34, 37, 38, 40-43, 46 and 48-52 rely, have been further limited to a determination of location based upon the log-ons and log-offs of the entities. Since Clare et al. uses radio transmitting units and functions differently than that of the claimed invention, the rejection is now improper and should be withdrawn.

4. Claims 3, 5, 14-16, 19, 25, 35, 36, 39 and 47 have been rejected as being obvious over Clare et al. in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,465,286 to Matsuda et al. However, Matsuda et al., as with Clare et al. is not directed to locating agents based upon logging in or logging out of a call center. As such, the combination cannot be said to teach or suggest the invention as now claimed. Since the combination does not teach or suggest the invention as now claimed, the rejections are now improper and should be withdrawn.

5. Allowance of claims 1-52, as now presented, is believed to be in order and such action is earnestly solicited. Should the Examiner be of the opinion that a telephone conference would expedite prosecution of the subject application, he is respectfully requested to telephone applicant's undersigned attorney.

Respectfully submitted,
WELSH & KATZ, LTD.



By

Jon P. Christensen

Registration No. 34,137

July 17, 2003
WELSH & KATZ, LTD.
120 South Riverside Plaza
22nd Floor
Chicago, Illinois 60606
(312) 655-1500